



5-Year Man on Campus With Ellison Clary

Vietnam Issue: Herman Speaks For The Doves

What with recent peace demonstrations at the pentagon and CBS correspondent Martin Agronski's speech on this campus last Wednesday, the American involvement in Vietnam, already a topic of considerable campus conversation, has become the subject of even more discussion.

It is reasonably safe to speculate that the majority of students here favor the withdrawal of United States troops from the hostilities, but the minority who advocate the continuation and fulfillment of American commitments in South Vietnam cannot be discounted altogether.

Therefore, this week and next, this column is committed to presenting student views both for and against U.S. involvement in the Vietnamese hostilities.

This week, Senior political science major Gene Herman of Addison Drive in Charlotte presents the case for those who favor the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

Herman is 33 years old and has been a student here since 1963. Spring Semester, 1967, he switched from night sessions to day classes. He has a previous college career at New York University between 1952 and 1955.

One of the primary organizers of the new group of vocal students, ACTION, Herman lists ten reasons for U.S. non-military involvement in Vietnam. His list reads as follows:

Lists Ten Reasons

1. The cultural and religious background of Indo-China (of which Vietnam is a part) is strictly nationalist and non subject to Chinese domination. There are significant segments of the population, North and South, which are Buddhist and Catholic.

2. History, recent and past, will show trade with China but never has the Indo-Chinese accepted Chinese domination. There has been a long history of conflict between Indo-China and China.

3. The Indo-Chinese struggled against Japanese domination under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh and were aided by the United States. The struggle was for Independence and freedom.

4. The U. S. supported British withdrawal from India and Malaysia, Dutch withdrawal from Indonesia and our own withdrawal from the Philippines. Why did we support through policy and materials French colonialism in Indo-China?

5. The Geneva Conference (1954) forced Ho Chi Minh to surrender half of Vietnam with the proviso that free elections would be held in 1956. This was never done.

6. The U. S. supported the puppet regime of Diem which never had fought for Vietnam's freedom.

7. The conflict which broke out after the Geneva convention was and is a struggle for unification. It is a civil war in which the U.S. has no legal political grounds to involve itself. It was identified as a civil war by the U. S. until 1965.

8. For his eighth point, Herman cites quotes by former presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, Secretary of Defense McNamara and President Johnson which repeatedly call for American non-involvement in an "all out war in Indo-China."

9. This is not another Munich. The struggle is from within and not from without. Granted the fight is being supplied, but from two camps, not one.

10. There is no valid substance to the concept of a "domino theory" . . . This is preposterous nonsense without any creditable basis.

How To Withdraw

How, then should the United States go about the business of withdrawal from Vietnam?

"The bombing should be stopped immediately," says Herman, "for an undefined time span and without any guarantees from the North."

He continues, "The expectation would be that there would be a response from Hanoi for discussion of the resolution of the conflict. If, four to six months after the bombing has ceased, there is no response, the entire issue should be placed in the hands of the United Nations.

"Any negotiations," he insists, "should include discussions of the eventual reunification of the whole country under any governmental system the majority of the people desire."

Within six months after the significant conflict has ceased, Herman believes ". . . the United States should withdraw unless requested to stay by the government in control of the nation of Vietnam."

Peace demonstrations in this country definitely serve a good purpose, whether they are peaceful or violent, according to Herman. They serve to call attention to the fact that there are elements in this society in opposition to the government policy in Vietnam, he contends.

"This country is strong enough to accept any criticism by anyone who wants to voice it," says Herman. "This statement is based on deep faith in democratic principles and philosophy," he continues. "Dissent by anyone for any purpose is provided for in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution."

Watch next week for the voice of a student who favors U.S. continued involvement in the Vietnamese hostilities.

Union, Govt. Issue Student Statement

The University Union Program Board and the Student Government Executive Council have met, and wish to make the following statement to the Student Body:

"The State laws of North Carolina prohibit alcoholic beverages on State property. The campus

regulations of UNC-C prohibit the display of alcoholic beverages by students or their guests at any school function. The enforcement of these regulations is at present the responsibility of the members of the Student Body, as it should be. The Student Body, however, must be a responsible one and must

act accordingly or the right of self regulation will be forfeited. It would then become necessary for this regulatory function to be performed by the University administration. If this were to happen, it would not only severely dampen our enthusiasm for developing a meaningful program of extra-curricular activities here, but would indicate that our Student Body is little more than a collection of predominantly irresponsible children displaying a high school attitude at best. We do not think that this is descriptive or our contemporaries here at UNC-C.

In closing, we would remind you that privilege is always accompanied by responsibility. With this in mind, we urge you to help us insure that our right of self-government is kept intact."

Letters To Editor Want More News? Tell TV Stations

Dear Editor:

Students, faculty, and members of the administration at UNC-C face a might decision: do they wish news on the most vital and controversial issue of the day or not? If the answer is yes, let them fetch pen and paper and implore the programmers of our local TV stations.

Case 1. The Frank McGee Report, Scherer McNeil Report, and Meet the Press have disappeared. On October 15, 1967, Meet the Press carried an interview with Governor Romney (he is interested in the US presidency). None of the local TV stations bestirred themselves to run it-- a callous act of disregard which would not have been tolerated in a major city of the United States.

Case 2. On October 1, there was a complete blackout on all sophisticated interview and news programs. No explanation. Just silence.

Case 3. On October 15, Firing Line and William F. Buckley, Jr., scheduled an interview at 11:30 p. m. (hardly prime TV time by anybody's standards) with Professor Hans Morgenthau, one of the most significant scholars in the field of international relations. What appeared at 11:30 p.m., however, was a rendition of the day's stock car races. Some who waited patiently to hear Morgenthau went to bed. Others more stalwart and persistent discovered the program at midnight (finally). No advance notice of the unscheduled change. No explanation. Presumably just a visceral preference for stock car races.

Case 4. On October 22, the 21st Century scheduled at 5:30 p.m. failed to appear. Instead twenty minutes of its time was unexplainably consumed by athletic games, which in point of fact had already been on continuously for more than three hours. No explanation. Just an incredible decision to amputate two-thirds of the 21st Century with the apparent assumption that the public would not notice.

What is happening in our city? How in the world can students be imbued with a sense of important values, and intellectuals maintain their sanity, when a clearly scheduled program probing the crucial issues of the day is suddenly displaced by a car race? Where are we as an avowedly informed society headed when news programs are plated on wheels and shunted back and forth into the most unseemly hours of the day--and, alas, even into oblivion?

Now this writer has not been idle. Careful letters to WSOC and WCCB in December, 1966, have yet to be acknowledged or answered. A public relations pitch from the Jefferson Standard Company (WBTV) was polite, but laced with placebos and palliatives. A more recent response from WSOC to my Observer letter of October 18, 1967 was an effort to illuminate the commercial dimensions of the television syndrome. Certainly the business world can be a grim place; but whatever the popularity polls show, a diet saturated with hum-

but is no fun.

All this has failed to persuade me that the transmission of basic news programs ought to rest on the precarious beneficence of television entrepreneurs or even the inexorable dictates of the marketplace. Somehow there must be an irresistible urge for public service in a community of a quarter of a million citizens who have proved so receptive to the establishment of UNC-C -- indeed for good reason. Charlotte stands to gain handsomely. And why not? Freedom of ideas and unfettered inquiry are the special business of a university as well as the general business of the American people. It is high time my colleagues on both sides of the podium joined me in the task of making this unequivocally clear.

Pen and paper please.
Nish Jamgotch, Jr.



"It wouldn't be so bad if he'd just stop that infernal whistling!"

Lack Maturity To Be Gentlemen

Dear Mr. Smith,

Enjoyed your "A Gentleman Is . . ." column in the scandal sheet. It is an unfortunate thing that most of us, regardless of our age, lack the maturity of exert sufficient emotional control over ourselves as to qualify as gentlemen. Perhaps we fear to exhibit strains of individuality when we are with others, for the scheral trend seems to be to exhibit those behavior patterns which the group considers as "in." Seldom are our thoughts, beliefs, or ideals our own -- tinted with any degree of originality, regardless of how rugged, imperfect, or unpolished they may be, they certainly are not.

I did disagree with one of your definitions, that one being, "one who allows the composition of his audience. . . expressing himself." It is true if applied in an uplifting manner, i.e., when one is attempting to communicate with those whose command of the language is better than our own, whose moral ideas and behavior are high-

er than our own, or whose character is purer than our own, then certainly should employ the best language of which he is capable. Surely it must lie heavily on the conscience of each of us when by our words and actions we act to the detriment of another.

The obverse, however, is not necessarily true. When, by circumstance or choice, we find ourselves in the midst of a group whose ideals and standards are beneath our own, then we are certainly not living up to the standards of "gentlemen" when we allow that group to cause us to lower our standards to their level, and to communicate in crude and uncouth terms. For it is certain that as soon as we do, while they may certainly understand us better, they no longer respect us. And what is a gentleman but one who by his behavior, bearing, and ideals, deserves and receives the respect of his associates?

Mitch Borden.

Biology Club Elects Officers

The Biology Club is now holding nomination of officers for the 1967-1968 school term. Election of officers will be held Wednesday, November 8, at the regular meeting of the club which will be held in K103 at 12:00 noon. Anyone who has completed eight hours of biology is encouraged to attend and is eligible to vote. Further information on the Biology Club can be

obtained at this meeting. Nominations for officers will not be closed until the Nov. 8 meeting.

SHORT RATIONS

Live within your income today and you'll find it's a very effective way to reduce.